WILSHIRE'S

"LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS"

GAYLORD WILSHIRE
·Editor·

Vol. XV. No. 11. NEW YORK AND LONDON, NOVEMBER, 1911. Price 2 Cents. per Copy.

The General Strike: Its Ramifications.

IT is impossible to conceive of the vast psychological change of attitude of all classes in England since the general strike on the railways last summer.

True, the strike only lasted a few days and the direct resulting gain to the workers was trivial, but it was the demonstration of what might be done that was of immense educative value to the community.

It showed the Capitalists how dangerous it is to push labor to extremes, and it showed labor that it has merely to use its solidarity to get anything it demands.

One direct result of the strike is a strong agitation for the Nationalisation of the Railways. Another result is the appointment by the Government of a new Board to examine into grievances of labor, and endeavor both to prevent strikes and to settle them if started.

Of course, there is no method nor idea of making the findings of the Board compulsory, but the creation of the Board, which is composed half of labor men and half of employers, is in itself a confession of the shock that has been given England.

It means that politics are to become more and more devoted to the desires of labor rather than to those of Capital.

One set of men who are most vitally interested in the development of the new syndicalist movement are the Labor Members of Parliament. The following, taken from the "Daily Express," a Tory paper, is significant and also interesting; but, considering the source, it must be taken with a grain of salt:

"A struggle, the vital importance of which both to organised trade unionists and to the general public can hardly be over-estimated, is being fought out at the present moment within the inner ranks of the Socialist-Labor Party.

The campaign in favour of "syndicalism," or the "general strike," which, as was shown in the "Express," has achieved so much popularity, threatens to sap to its foundations the power and authority of the group of political Socialists, who, under the leadership of Mr. MacDonald, have so long controlled the fortunes and funds of the party.

When, in 1900, the Labor Party, or the Labor Representation Committee as it was then known, came into being, avowedly Socialist organisations were for the first time in the history of the labor movement admitted to the inner councils of the trade unions.

A leading Socialist, who had never been a member of a trade union, was appointed secretary, in the person of Mr. MacDonald, and almost from the first the small section of Socialists took control both of the policy and of the large funds which were placed at the disposal of the new body.

Throughout the whole of the existence of the party the Socialist grip on its control has never slackened, despite the fact that the proportion of members in the affiliated Socialist societies has never been larger than one in eighteen, and is now only one in forty. The vast trade union majority has never made an effort to emancipate itself.

The only section of the party which has made a serious bid for power, and places, of the Socialist wirepullers has been the small number of revolutionary Socialists belonging to what is now the Social-Democratic Party, who, though unable to join the party as representatives of the Social-Democratic Party, have crept in as representatives of various trade unions.

Time after time this little band has endeavoured, by attacking the political policy of the Socialist leaders, to overthrow them. In unmeasured language they have denounced the Parliamentary astuteness, the policy of tactics and compromise, championed by Mr. MacDonald and the other stalwarts of the Independent Labor Party and the Fabians, such as Mr. Pease, Mr. W. C. Anderson, and Mr. Bruce Glasier. But each time they have failed.

Now at last, however, it would seem as though their time was coming. While they have been attacking the politics of the secretary in open conference they have at the same time been steadily undermining his influence in the lodges of the trade unions.

For the time being they have dropped their Socialism as Socialism and have devoted themselves with an earnestness worthy of a better cause to preaching syndicalism.

"Labor is the same whether it is exploited by the capitalists in the factory, the foundry, or on the railway," they say. "What is the use of small unions fighting small battles? The only weapon with which you can fight the serried forces of capitalism is that of the general strike, whereby the whole forces of trade unionism will be brought to bear whenever capitalism, in whatever trade or whatever part of the country, dares to put up a fight."

Recent events in the shape of the transport workers' strike in London and the railway strike have given an immense impetus to this propaganda. It has appealed strongly to trade unionists who have become tired of the "little by little" policy of the Socialist-Labor Party.

The average trade unionist is not an enthusiast regarding the work of the Labor Party in Parliament. "They've got fine fat jobs," he says when he refers to the Socialist-Labor M.P.'s, "but I don't get much out of it. Politics are not much good any way. What I want is more wages and less work."

This is exactly what the new policy promises, as it is revealed in the speeches of Mr. Ben Tillett, Mr. Tom Mann, Mr. Harry Quelch, Mr. Will Thorne, and other prominent members of the revolutionary group.

Of course, they are aware of its fallacies, so ably exposed by their own "comrade," Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, in his recent article in the *Socialist Review*. But to the rank and file of working men it has come with all the force of a new gospel.

"It is the product of the creative intelligence of the man who is impatient because it takes the earth twenty-four hours to wheel round the sun," says

Mr. Ramsay MacDonald. "It is the workers' only hope," declare the revolutionary Socialists, and, unfortunately, they are being believed.

Many of the older trade unionists are throwing in their lot with the syndicalists, not because they believe in the new policy, but because they see in it an opportunity of overthrowing once and for all the power of the politicians, and once more bringing back trade unionism to its original industrial basis.

Their outlook is a short-sighted one, however. The originators of the new policy are none the less Socialists and revolutionaries because for the moment they are syndicalists. Their object in bringing about a great confederation of trade unions pledged to support each other in a general strike is not to make war on low wages and long hours, but to make war on society.

"They wish to unite all unions into one," to quote Mr. MacDonald again, "and then to paralyse society by a strike," Mr. MacDonald may well be bitter. With infinite patience he has created a Parliamentary machine which has been able to force "the most powerful Government of modern times" into paths of Socialism of which its members had never dreamed. With the coming of payment of members he has seen his ideal of a Socialist Party in the House of Commons a hundred strong within reach of realisation, and now the whole fabric is tumbling about his ears.

The "political industrialism" of Mr. MacDonald and his supporters has been a menace to the country. It has played no little part in the attacks on liberty and individual responsibility under which the country has suffered in recent years. But it has been as nothing to the danger with which the country is faced in the growth and success of the new policy.

Mr. MacDonald, like Frankenstein, has created a monster. Will it, like Frankenstein's monster, overwhelm him?"

It is impossible to think that such an imperative weapon as the general strike will ever be abandoned by labor on account of the difficulty and danger of handling it. Admittedly the general strike is a two-edged sword, and admittedly labor may, at the beginning, find that the battles won by it are gained at a tremendous cost. But man has yet to abandon a new and effective tool because he may have injured himself in learning how to use it.

On the other hand, I have yet to see the logic of the Syndicalist position that declares politics to be played out, and that labor should use but the one weapon, the General Strike, to gain its ends.

The World Do Move.

California has passed by popular vote three important amendments to her Constitution—namely: The Initiative and Referendum, The Recall, and Woman Suffrage.

In 1890 I was the candidate of the Socialists for Congress from Los Angeles, and every one of these reforms was in my platform.

I was the only candidate for Congress nominated in the whole of the United States for that election.

It has taken just twenty-one years to see the fruition of that election.

Dynamiting Taft.

Why anyone but a Burns' detective or a lunatic should have attempted to dynamite Taft's train baffles the human intellect.

Taft, by his blunders, is doing more to bring the social problem up for solution than any man who ever sat in the Presidential chair. I am sure that every Socialist has a far greater fear of any event that would make a martyr of Taft than Taft had of making Warren a martyr.

A Significant Bit of History.

"La Follette's Magazine."

Congress once ordered the Supreme Court of the United States to keep its hands off from a certain law. The Supreme Court obeyed. The story of this incident is told by Allan L. Benson, in the third article of his series on "The Usurped Power of the Courts," now appearing in *Pearson's*. It is a little known, but tremendously significant, chapter in American history.

"After the Civil War various reconstruction Acts were passed, the most important of which divided the South, exclusive of Tennessee, into ten military districts, the chief administrative officer in each of which was a United States army officer. The reconstruction Acts were bitterly contested, not only in the South, but in the White House and in the President's Cabinet. Northern men were arrested in the Southern States and their lives placed in jeopardy. To remedy this situation Congress passed the Act of February 5, 1867, which gave the right of appeal in habeas corpus cases to the Supreme Court of the United States.

"This arrangement worked very well for the North until a Southern man sought to take advantage of the law. The Southern man was W. H. McCardle, a Mississippi editor. On November 12, 1867, he was arrested by order of Major-General Ord, commanding the district of Mississippi, on charges of libel, inciting to insurrection, disorder, and violence. McCardle was the insignificant proprietor of a cross-roads sheet, and his appeal attracted no attention until it began to be noised around Washington that the Supreme Court intended to take advantage of the situation to declare all of the reconstruction Acts unconstitutional. That meant, of course, the disruption of the Northern plans for the subjugation of the South."

Thereupon the Republicans who controlled Congress bestirred themselves. Result: the passage of a Bill divesting the Supreme Court of jurisdiction in the case before it, as well as in similar cases. President Johnson vetoed it, but it was passed over his veto. And the Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to do this. Of course, the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is conferred by the Constitution; but note that the Construction provides that, in the case of appellate jurisdiction, it is conferred "with such exceptions, and under such regulations, as the Congress shall make." Congress simply chose to make an "exception" in this case. And the Supreme Court made no attempt to set aside the reconstruction laws. It submitted to the constitutional power of Congress—when Congress chose to exercise it.

A Judicial Mind in Action.

"Saturday Evening Post."

President Taft's Trust speech at Detroit exhibits the judicial temperament in its most discouraging state. He regards the Trust problem as virtually settled by the decisions of the Supreme Court in the oil and tobacco cases, which are "making those great combinations divide themselves into actually competing parts. . . . It needed these two great decisions to teach the business public that not in the supreme tribunal of this country would the claim be listened to that we have passed beyond the possibility of free competition. . . . I am glad to think that business men who have been violating the Trust law are now being made to see the necessity of changing their original organisation, giving up the idea that it is necessary to control markets, and reverting to the old principle of free competition in which all limits upon it to prevent its being excessive must be self-imposed by the good sense of each competitor."

Clearly, Mr. Taft rests in a blissful assurance that unrestricted competition has been restored because the Supreme Court has said it should be. By looking into a law book he sees "business men giving up the idea that it is necessary to control markets and reverting to the old principle of free competition," and that completely satisfies him. The trifling fact that free competition has nowhere been restored except on paper disturbs him not at all. His innocent belief that the Trust problem is to be discovered in a law library rather than in the markets, and that tacking up some new signs on office doors conformably to a court decision quite solves the problem, exhibits the judicial temperament in its most hopeless aspect. His attention is fixed, not upon what is, but upon what a court says shall be. Evidently no progress toward a solution of the actual problem is to be expected from Mr. Taft.

Striking for a Labor Trust.

"The Literary Digest."

THAT the strike on the Harriman lines is an effort to confront a railroad combination with a labor "trust" is not apparently denied by the men or their leaders, and while most of the daily press condemn the strike on this ground, just as they condemn Standard Oil or the Sugar Trust, the labor organs, as far as we have seen, glory in the fact and argue that such a combination of labor is just what is needed. This strike, which calls out 35,000 men, and affects the Harriman system from the Mississippi to the Pacific and the Illinois Central from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, is declared because these railroads refuse to deal with a federation of unions. They will deal separately with the five unions making up the Federation of Shop Employees, but not with the Federation itself. "If we win this strike," declares James W. Kline, international president of the Blacksmiths' and Helpers' Union, "all the railroads in the United States will submit to a federation." "We might as well turn over our roads to the men as grant their demands," replies Julius Kruttschnitt, vice-president and director of maintenance and operation of the Harriman lines. The union leaders, according to a San Francisco dispatch, frankly urge that the unions must follow the example of capital in the matter of combination and centralisation.

"For the first time," remarks the Brooklyn *Standard Union*, "the issue has been squarely made between the corporation and labor; not as organised into independent trade unions, but as federated, consolidated into a central unit, with control over all the branches and combinations, the very latest and extremest form of the trust." These trade unionists, declares the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, aim at "the formation of a trust that would be as intolerant and insolent in the exercise of its powers in restraint of trade as are any of those against which the powers of the Federal Government have been brought to bear." The labor papers are in the main yet to be heard from.

In addition to the recognition of the Federation of Shop Employees, despatches state, the strikers ask that the railroads compel all shop employees to join this federation, whether they wish to or not, and they further demand for their organisation the right to designate the men to be laid off when the force is cut down, and the right to say whether any particular employee shall be discharged or suspended. They also demand the abandonment of the premium or bonus system. If the companies agreed to deal with the Federation instead of with the individual unions, remarks Mr. Kruttschnitt, "an issue raised on a small-system road in Louisiana or Texas might stop all shop work through the entire system by requiring members to strike in distant California, Oregon, Washington, or Nebraska." And in his formal answer to the labor representatives he says:—

"If the essentials of admittedly fair and considerate treatment, the payment of highest wages of any railroads in the territories served by our lines, and the guaranty of hospitable and generous pension benefits have not been sufficient to deter our shopmen from terminating agreements insuring these conditions made from time to time in conference with their labor unions, and from spending four or five months in devising new issues and means to destroy existing harmonious relations, and, moreover, are not sufficient to induce them to remain in our employ and to make them realise their duty to the public, I do not see that we can do anything more to convince them that they have no good reason to stop work, or to prevent your giving approval and permission to them to leave our service."

Commenting upon this, President Kline, of the Blacksmiths' Union, says:—

"The position the railroads take is arbitrary. Mr. Kruttschnitt refers to good wages, the pension system, and other admirable things done by the Harriman lines. He says nothing, however, of the damnable physical examinations, the personal-record system, and the rank discrimination practised by the railroads. . . . The men will not recede. The matter of wages is an after-consideration. They demand to deal as a unit with the roads, and to treat with them on equal terms."

He explains, also, that the Federation is formed not only "for protection," but "in the interest of economy and convenience," as it "should be easier to deal with one committee than with a dozen." "From their own point of view," admits the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, "the representatives of the men have strong ground to stand on"; but the same paper thinks that the position of the railroads is even stronger. The Philadelphia *Record*, however, is inclined to think that the refusal of the railroads to recognise the Federation was unduly arbitrary. To Mr. Kruttschnitt's assertion that such recognition would place the unions "in absolute control" of the railroads the New York *Call* (Socialist) replies unhesitatingly that "they should control." It goes on to say:—

"The men on the Harriman roads, having come to a realisation of the power combination gives them, had started to federate all the departments. The Harriman lines, among the most powerful in this country, are themselves the result of the federation of lines that had been weakened through competition, and in some instances brought almost to the verge of disaster through their 'individual efforts' at independence.

"But the present heads of those lines instantly realised that what had been good for them through combination of separate roads into a federal system would not have the same beneficent effect if the various crafts employed on the roads were also federated into a system."

President of China.

Sounds funny, but why not President of China? The main reason is not so much that Manchu Emperors are out of fashion as that Presidents are also rather out of fashion—back numbers, so to speak.

Do you ever hear of the doings of the President of France or of Switzerland?

The final political state of man will be without either President or Emperor; the people themselves will be the kings and presidents, for they will appoint the man they want to do the presiding over their Assembly while it is in session, and he will be subject to retirement at any moment they may wish to recall him. Let Taft faint. The laws the Assembly passes will also be subject to rejection and repeal by the people, even though Cardinal Gibbons thinks such democracy horrid.

The Chinese can have no illusions about the perfection of life in America under a President Taft, that they are willing to risk boiling oil in order to have a chance of adopting our Constitution.

No doubt the Manchu Dynasty is pretty bad, but so is the Morgan Dynasty; and the Manchus pretend to reign for the people, whereas the House of Morgan makes not even a pretence.

However, if nothing else, the United States is a good "horrible example" of the failure of Capitalistic Republics for dynastic-laden countries to beware of following.

Manchu Log may be a dull king, but Morgan Stork is no change for the better.

Italy in Tripoli.

Italy, of course, has no right to grab Tripoli, except the right of might; but I cannot see that there should be any surprise that she should have made the grab. It is a wonder she did not do so years ago.

It is probably a question as to whether she will really gain much economic advantage from the conquest. Turkey will undoubtedly gain by losing Tripoli. The trade there does not pay for the fleet to guard it.

It was in the natural order of events for Tripoli to be swallowed by Italy, and the sooner the operation is over with, and Turkey has gracefully acquiesced, the better it will be for all concerned.

Established 1900.

WILSHIRE'S MAGAZINE.

Published Monthly by
Wilshire Publishing Co.,
113, E. 26th Street,
New York City.
GAYLORD WILSHIRE,
Editor.

Subscription, Post Paid to any address in the World, 25 cents per year. Subscriptions may be sent to the London Office at the rate of One Shilling per year.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.....*President*
H. R. KEARNS.....*Vice-President.*
WM. H. LEFFINGWELL.....*Sec'y and Treas.*

Entered at the New York Post Office as second class matter.

London Office: GOLDER'S GREEN, London, N.W.

Vol. XV. NOVEMBER, 1911. No. 11.

Taft Defying Nature.

It's a very interesting situation just now for the Trusts. The law says that they must compete, and Taft, looking forward to the next election, is apparently doing all he can to make them compete. He says by 1913 he will have them all competing.

Taft must know better. It seems absurd that any man to-day with the least knowledge of business can think that it's possible to restore competition by dissolving the Trusts into their component parts, or by any other method, for that matter.

However, Taft wants re-election, and he thinks that the only way to get it is to bow to the popular will, and go hot-foot after the Trusts.

I can readily understand the surprise and disgust of Morgan and the financiers at this attitude of their old friend. But no doubt they see the necessity Taft has for putting on a front, and they also must see that no matter who in the future may be in the Presidential chair—unless it should be a Socialist—that he will be forced to hound the Trusts.

Taft is a lawyer, and as a lawyer he has little first-hand knowledge of business. He thinks there is something holy about a law passed by Congress, something miraculous, that will make it prevail against a law of nature. No doubt Taft would look for our winters to be free from frost if Congress should pass a law ordering the thermometer to keep above the freezing point.

If, in spite of the law, it should freeze, it would be quite like Taft to instruct Wickersham to begin suit against Jack Frost. "Anything to satisfy the public," is Taft's motto —before election.

Bryan's Cross of Gold.

We don't hear much nowadays from Bryan about the "cross of gold."

And yet it's but ten years ago when Bryan was the spokesman of a great Party which clamoured that low prices were crucifying labor, declaring that we must have free silver to raise prices and emancipate labor.

To-day we hear of food riots all over the world on account of high prices. Labor doesn't seem to appreciate its emancipation.

What does Bryan say to all this?

According to his free silver theory we should to-day be in a state of bliss. Surely the length of the gold purchasing rod has been shortened enough in the last few years, has it not?

But instead of the workers taking their emancipation with proper enthusiasm, due to the Bryan theory, they are threatening a general strike. They say prices are so high that their present wages keep them in a state of semi-starvation.

However, we believe that Bryan has lately made the great discovery that the true reason of poverty is not that labor is crucified on a gold cross, but that labor drinks too much whiskey.

Let us have local option in Nebraska, says Bryan, and the millennium will be near at hand.

Poor Bryan! he might have led a great cause if he only had had courage and brains. However, he has the consolation that with him in the Down and Out Club is his old antagonist "Teddy R."

Time makes strange political bedfellows.

Hyndman's Reminiscences.

The new method of teaching a child is to make the subject so interesting that he will learn unconsciously and with delight. There is no trouble in getting an American boy to learn the names of the great base-ball players with their average base-hits. He absorbs the rules of base-ball with his mother's milk.

Why should he not absorb history and arithmetic as eagerly as base-ball if we invented a system of making the subjects as interesting as base-ball? No reason at all; and, what's more, the new system is really being developed.

Now, Socialism for Socialists is base-ball to a base-ball fanatic—I believe they call them "fans"—and, therefore, when H. M. Hyndman makes his book such delightful reading, he really wasted his time. For American Socialists will naturally read the autobiography of the greatest Socialist—English-speaking Socialist—anyway. They are so interested in both the man and his subject.

Small type, poor English, and a bad style never kept a boy from reading the newspaper report of how the home nine licked the Chicago's.

It is gilding the lily for us when Hyndman gives a perfectly printed book, together with a most interesting and exciting story, a narrative intimately bringing in all the great Radical and Socialist leaders of the world in the last century as well as this, and all told in the crispest English and most fascinating style.

It is the story of a man who has given his life to Socialism, and has had a most interesting time in the giving, and who loses no points in the telling.

It gives a vital picture of Karl Marx by a man who was his intimate, physically and intellectually, and who has done more to expound Marx to the English-reading world than any living man.

It is a book giving the aspirations and ideas of the man who to-day is in the forefront of the English Socialist movement, and who is possibly just approaching the commanding position in the public eye that he should have attained, had the public not been an ass, twenty years ago.

In another column will be seen a more extended notice of the book, together with two contrasting reviews of it, one by a Tory editor and one by a Socialist. There is not so much difference that one might look for.

La Follette and Taft.

I have always been a great admirer of the earnestness and courage of La Follette, and it is gratifying that he is now coming so rapidly to the front as a possible Presidential nominee of the Republican Party. True, Taft has the immense prestige of being the present incumbent, and were there not a strong fear of his defeat there would not be a thought of another candidate. But insurgency is growing by leaps and bounds, and La Follette is the logical Insurgents' candidate.

As a Socialist, there is not much of any difference between the nominal programmes of Taft and La Follette. Both say that the Trusts must be destroyed, and both are supporters of the principle of competition. But La Follette is free from control of either political or industrial captains, whereas Taft—well, Taft is Taft.

Mr. Carnegie should lose no time in sending one of his famous hero-medals to the editor of the New York *Tribune*, who is defending the Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act.—*St. Paul's Pioneer Press.*

Canada's Escape from Plutocracy.

IT was not surprising that Canada should reject the Reciprocity Treaty. The mere proving that such a treaty might economically benefit her was not half the battle.

There had, in addition, to be an argument set forth that Canada's chance of remaining a nation separate from the United States was in no way endangered.

There can certainly be no question but that the treaty would have made it comparatively easy for our Trusts to have invaded Canada. This, indeed, was one object of the treaty. It was obvious that if our Trusts were to supply the Canadian market that the Canadian manufacturers would just to that extent be crowded out.

True, the Canadian people would have been benefited in so far as they were consumers. But it must be remembered that these consumers were very often also manufacturers themselves, or were employees of manufacturers. What they might gain as consumers was far more than offset by their loss as producers.

What a man wants first is money to buy with, and it's no use arguing with him that Reciprocity will make lower prices if Reciprocity will take away the profits or wages with which he buys. He would rather do without Reciprocity and hold on to wages than to have low prices with no wages.

The fundamental trouble is not inability to produce cheap enough, but to find a market for what is already produced.

The Free Trade fallacy is that if we lower costs of production by freedom of exchange between nations, then the markets will be so widened that all goods would be easily absorbed.

This argument held good until the Socialists discovered that the trouble of finding a market arose not from the inability to produce cheap enough, but because the working class, who formed the bulk of the consumers, were not paid enough to purchase what their labor had produced.

I doubt if the Canadians knew very much about this argument against Free Trade and Reciprocity; in fact, they could not, very well, for they are not Socialists; but they voted as if they understood.

However, I think the main thing that swayed them was sentiment rather than reason. It was the fear of drifting into a political alliance with this Trust-ridden United States.

Canada may be dominated by her capitalists, but she has no Supreme Court with a written constitution to protect her capitalists from the will of the people.

Is it any wonder that she should be deaf to any arguments in favour of Reciprocity when there was the slightest basis for the cry that Reciprocity was a stepping-stone to her political and industrial domination by the Yankee plutocracy? Why should she sacrifice her soul to her body?

It's strange that no comment has been made upon the fact that whereas Reciprocity was offered to Canada by Taft without any thought of a referendum to the American voter upon the subject, that Laurier risked, and indeed lost, his political life by referring the Bill to the Canadian electorate.

The Americans seemed to take it for granted that upon such questions Congress shall have the final say without any referendum to the people, whereas the Canadians equally took it for granted that their Parliament would never think of accepting the treaty until the voters themselves had had a chance of expressing their wishes at a general election.

It seems to me that this very difference of political methods should have warned the Canadians that they had nothing to gain and everything to lose by taking one step towards an alliance with this American plutocracy.

Cardinal Gibbons Against the Referendum

IT'S not very often that the Roman Catholic Church shows her hand in American politics. That subtle foe to democracy knows pretty well that her open support of a proposed measure is very apt to add anything but popularity to it. It is therefore interesting to note that Cardinal Gibbons recently said in his Jubilee sermon :—

"At the present moment there are three political problems which are engaging the serious attention of our public men.

"It is proposed that United States Senators should be elected by popular vote, instead of being chosen by the Legislature, as is prescribed by the Constitution.

"It is proposed that the acts of our Legislature, before they have the force of law, should be submitted to the suffrage of the people who would have the right to vote.

"It is proposed to recall or remove an unpopular judge before the expiration of his term of office.

"The election of Senators by the votes of the people involves the destruction of a strong bulwark against dangerous popular encroachments. The reason given for the contemplated change is that many of our State Legislatures are charged with being venal, and that it is easier to corrupt the Legislature than the whole people. In reply I would say: If you cannot trust the members of the Legislature how can you trust their constituents, from whom they spring? If you cannot confide in our Legislatures you cannot confide in human government or in human nature itself. If a few of our Legislatures have been found guilty of bribery, it is most unjust to involve all the others in their condemnation. I have sufficient confidence in the moral integrity of our Legislatures to be convinced that the great majority of them have never bent the knee to Mammon.

"To give to the masses the right of annulling the acts of the Legislature is to substitute mob law for established law.

"To recall a judge because his decisions do not meet with popular approval is an insult to the dignity, the independence, and the self-respect of our judiciary. Far less menacing to the commonwealth is an occasional corrupt or incompetent judge than one who would be the habitual slave of a capricious multitude, who has always his ear to the ground trying to find out the verdict of the people.

"The Constitution of the United States is the palladium of our liberties and our landmark in our march of progress. That instrument has been framed by the anxious cares and enlightened zeal of the Fathers of the Republic. Its wisdom has been tested and successfully proved after a trial of a century and a-quarter. It has weathered the storms of the century which is passed, and it should be trusted for the centuries to come. What has been good enough for our fathers ought to be good enough for us. Every change, either in the political or religious world, is not a reformation. Better to 'bear those ills we have than fly to others that we know not of.' Every man that runs about waving a new panacea for social evils is not to be worshipped as a political and moral reformer. We all remember the story of Aladdin and the Wonderful Lamp.

Better to trust to the old Lamp of the Fathers, which has guided the steps of the American people for four generations, than to confide to every ignis fatuus that may lead us into dangerous pitfalls. Do not disturb the political landmarks of the Republic."

When the head of the Roman Catholic Church in America feels called upon to join President Taft and denounce the three great proposed reforms of to-day, it shows that the dry bones of ancient superstition, both political and ecclesiastical, are commencing to rattle.

The Cardinal should read the following by W. F. MacLean, editor of the *Toronto Globe*, upon "the palladium of our liberties":—

"The supreme merit and usefulness of the English system as it prevails in Great Britain, and more or less in the Empire, is that government is unlimited. It is true that Canada and Australia are, in a measure, limited by written constitutions; but if they are, these can be changed without trouble. The United States Constitution is almost beyond change, and that is its trouble. In Great Britain any political, social, financial, or other problem of the State can be settled by a vote of the people in a general election, and then crystallised into an Act of Parliament. The most sweeping revolution in the British Constitution has been effected in our own day, and in this very year, by cutting away the veto power of the House of Lords, and this has been done with an agitation of less than five years.

"The worst thing of all is that the financial abuses which are so enormous and far-reaching are all entrenched in the Constitution. You must smash the Constitution to smash the abuses.

"Cease, oh, you Americans, your worship of the political wisdom of your fathers; get once more at the task of reviewing or altering, or smashing, if necessary, a human invention that you in your easy-going ways have exalted into a revelation—and Mormondom is also a revelation—study government in other places, regard your needs, not your hand-downs from the past, study free government as it is in England and in her daughter States to-day, recognise the task ahead, and, recognising it, assume it, no matter the consequences."

A Canadian, being uninfluenced by the glamour that hypnotises most Americans when they speak with bated breath of the sacred Constitution, is really much better able to see the slavery it has imposed upon us than we can ourselves.

We are too blinded by awe, but we are recovering sanity.

Packers utilise all the hog but the squeal. At least something is left for the consumer.—*Wall Street Journal.*

Doc Wiley says the health of the nation is worth $540,000,000,000. Is this an intimation for a rise in salary?—*Dayton Journal.*

Taft's Change of Views.

"La Follette's Magazine."

What confusion must follow the inclusion of the word "reasonable" in the Anti-Trust Law was forcibly stated by President Taft in his message of January 7, 1910. He said:—

"Many people conducting great businesses have cherished a hope and belief that in some way or other a line may be drawn between 'good trusts' and 'bad trusts,' and that it is possible by amendment to the anti-trust law to make a distinction under which good combinations may be permitted to organise, suppress competition, control prices, and do it all legally if only they do not abuse the power by taking too great profit out of business. They point with force to certain notorious trusts as having grown into power through criminal methods by the use of illegal rebates and plain cheating, and by various acts utterly violative of business honesty and morality, and urge the establishment of some legal line of separation by which 'criminal trusts' of this kind can be punished, and they, on the other hand, be permitted under the law to carry on their business. Now the public, and especially the business public, ought to rid themselves of the idea that such a distinction is practicable or can be introduced into the statute. Certainly under the present anti-trust law no such distinction exists. It has been proposed, however, that the word 'reasonable' should be made a part of the statute, and that then it should be left to the court to say what is a reasonable restraint of trade, what is a reasonable suppression of competition, what is a reasonable monopoly. I venture to think that this is to put into the hands of the court a power impossible to exercise on any consistent principle which will insure the uniformity of decision essential to good judgment. *It is to thrust upon the courts a burden that they have no precedents to enable them to carry, and to give them a power approaching the arbitrary, the abuse of which might involve our whole judicial system in disaster.*"

That was in January, 1910. In June, 1911, after the Supreme Court had handed down its decision in the Standard Oil and Tobacco Trust cases, he said something quite different. He completely reversed his view upon the matter of changing the law. He said:—

"I believe those decisions have done and will continue to do great good to all the business of the country, and that they have laid down a line of distinction which it is not difficult for honest and intelligent business men to follow."

And he says that the law, as amended by the Court, has made it largely "a question of fact and a question of conscience with the business community" as to the standard of their future action. In other words, the business community is to be guided by "conscience" and not by law.

Hyndman's Life.

A most interesting book just out by the Father of English Socialism and founder of the new British Socialist Party.

THE RECORD OF AN ADVENTUROUS LIFE.

By H. M. Hyndman. With Portrait. 8vo. $3.50 net.

What the London papers say of the book:—

The Evening Standard.—"It is delightful. . . . We commend it for entertainment to readers of all shades of opinion."

Pall Mall Gazette.—"Few retrospects of English society in the last forty years are more instructive or entertaining."

Daily News.—"Uncommonly good reading."

Daily Chronicle.—"Of absorbing interest. . . . Full of good things."

Daily Graphic.—"No one can deny that Mr. Hyndman has a story well worth the telling, and a way of telling it that is extremely effective."

Morning Post.—"Where the book is interesting and delightful is in its story of the full life of a vivacious and generous soul."

Morning Leader.—"Mr. Hyndman's book is one of the best worth reading of its kind."

The Globe (Tory).—"We need hardly say that with the peculiar opinions with which Mr. Hyndman is associated we have very little sympathy, but that fact does not prevent us from enjoying the interesting and entertaining book in which their development is unfolded. Mr. Hyndman, who comes, as he says, 'like most well-to-do people of the upper middle class in this island, from a decent piratical stock,' is certainly not one of those who become Socialists because they desire to share the money they are too lazy to make. A genuine belief in the truth of Karl Marx's theories and a very real sympathy with the condition of the poorer classes have driven him to the shelter of the Red Flag. He has a most wholesome detestation of the hypocrisy which calls itself Liberalism, and, but for a certain natural tendency to rebellion, he might very well have been a Conservative social reformer. Indeed, we have rarely come across more convincing proof than this book affords that a Socialist is very often a Tory gone sour. It is rather striking in this connection to learn that the late Lord Beaconsfield, not a very accessible person, or much given to the encouragement of faddists of any sort, gave him a long interview in which to develop his special ideas. We know what Mr. Hyndman said to Lord Beaconsfield, but we do not know what he thought of it, though perhaps the author of 'Sybil, or The Two Nations,' was not really so unsympathetic as his words would seem to convey. That 'damned old Jew,' as Mr. Hyndman declares the late James Lowther once

described him, was receptive of new ideas to the very last, and never wavered in his belief that the true mission of the Tory Party lay in the direction of social reform. Mr. Hyndman is neither a Conservative nor a Churchman, but he can get on much better with either one or the other than with a Liberal or a Nonconformist, and his only surviving sister is a prominent member of the Primrose League. He certainly has the right to call his life 'adventurous,' for he was with Garibaldi in Italy, has escaped death in the South Seas by a series of miracles, has sold papers in the London streets attired in a silk hat and a frock coat, has mingled in all sorts of riots, has known Mazzini, and quarrelled with Karl Marx. This militant Socialist is the grandson of a slave-owner, and is, we are glad to see, not the least ashamed of the fact. Words have less influence upon him than realities—wherein, if we may say so, he differs from most of his kidney—and he avows that if he had to choose he would rather be a well-kept slave on a West Indian estate than 'a sweated free white wage-earner in one of our great cities.' Most men mellow with age and become reasonably tolerant. Not so Mr. Hyndman. If anybody wants a perfectly unprejudiced opinion of the Socialist leaders we commend these pages to his attention. He seems to have had tiffs with nearly everybody in the movement, including even William Morris, with whom we should have thought nobody could have quarrelled except over wallpapers. Mr. Bernard Shaw is called 'Oscar Wilde's follower'; Engels has 'an overbearing character'; Briand is 'ill-conditioned' and 'a perfect nuisance'; Champion is 'an intriguer'; and Kropotkin 'wholly unscrupulous.' As for Mr. John Burns, our author fairly foams at the mouth when he thinks of him. Well, well, 'the falling out of faithful friends renewal is of love,' but there is a lot to be learned by the outsider while the 'amantium iræ' are in progress. Compared with prominent Socialists as assessed by Mr. Hyndman, porcupines must be angels to live with. The Lord help the rest of us when they are top dog."

Justice (Socialist).—"This is, indeed, not only the record of an adventurous, but of a strenuous life. In reading what Hyndman has to say of the many-sidedness of William Morris, and his restless activity, one feels that the same might be said of our author himself, with this addition: that he has not had the compensation in any department of life which Morris found in some, but has held on steadfastly and unflinchingly, mid discouragements and disappointments which might well have destroyed the enthusiasm of the most sanguine. In the course of a struggle against overwhelming odds, which has been the history of the Socialist movement in this country; a struggle not only against the cunning devices of the capitalist enemy, but also against the stupidity, ignorance, apathy, and conceit of the workers themselves; a struggle in which the reverses and discouragements have far outnumbered the triumphs, Hyndman has never faltered or hesitated. In the very worst times, when difficulties have thickened, friends have fallen away, and the future has seemed at its darkest, any among us who have felt discouraged and disheartened have been spurred to fresh effort and fresh hope by the never-failing cheery optimism of our splendid 'Old Man,' as some of us long ago dubbed Hyndman, not as suggesting age—he has always been the youngest of us—but as a term of affection and esteem.

"Hyndman has often been blamed for excessive and needlessly bitter condemnation of men who have sold out, or otherwise ratted from or betrayed the cause. All that is to be ascribed to the very sensibility and acuteness of feeling which he has frequently and successfully hidden under his cheery optimism. Only those who love and feel strongly can hate strongly, and only those who have been literally wounded in the house of their friends can appreciate the bitterness which Hyndman must feel, and which some of us, at any rate, fully share, towards those who have used and abused our movement in order to serve their sordid personal ambitions.

"This bitterness, however, finds no place in the references to the many interesting personalities to whom we are introduced in this book, who were outside the Socialist movement altogether. On the contrary, the impartial critic will be inclined to say that our author is much too generous in his estimate of some of these. Nor can it be said that he is niggardly in his praise or his estimate of the qualities of the men in the movement—Marx, Engels, Morris, Liebknecht, and Jaurès—with whom he has on occasion found reason to differ.

"Interesting as are the reminiscences of our comrade Hyndman of the movement to which he has devoted the best years of his life, we are inclined to think that those who have known him best as a Social-Democrat will turn with still greater interest to those of his earlier years. That a man of his exceptional gifts, and his great social advantages—the world before him where to choose—and practically any career in life open to him—that such a man should have practically thrown all this to the winds and have devoted himself whole-heartedly to a movement which, thirty years ago, appeared the most forlorn of forlorn hopes, naturally occasions interest, curiosity, and wonderment. Why should he? Or, if he, why not others? These are questions to which some of Hyndman's most intimate comrades have never been able to give a satisfactory answer. It is true that there have been others who, belonging to the same class as Hyndman, have come into the movement. But who, with his advantages, has done so at so much personal loss as he has done? And who among them has 'stayed the course'?

"To this question, however, the record of the early life of our author, interesting reading as it affords, scarcely supplies an answer, and we can only conclude that his espousal of Socialism was the outcome of a moral, æsthetic, and intellectual revolt against the monstrous conditions engendered by capitalism.

"We are sometimes told by our enemies, and even by some of our friends, that we Social-Democrats have failed. But these reminiscences of our veteran comrade and leader are not the record of failure, but of a success which few of us who had any part in the launching of the new movement in 1881 could have possibly anticipated. Let anyone read Hyndman's perfectly accurate description of the situation in 1880 and compare it with that of to-day, and he will be fain to admit that we have accomplished a greater work than any other body in the same period of time. We have achieved a revolution—not *the* revolution yet!—but a revolution in the mental attitude of all sorts and conditions of men towards Socialism. We have made Socialism a real, vital, active force in the political life of the nation. And a full share of the credit of that achievement belongs to H. M. Hyndman. In measuring the work that has been accomplished, it is necessary to compare it with what others, our predecessors who also gave their lives to the work, were able to achieve in a similar period. When the Democratic Federation was started in 1881 over thirty years had elapsed since the Chartist movement, the revolutionary uprisings of '48, and the publication of the Communist Manifesto. Yet the Communist Manifesto, and even the name of its great author, were not known to more than a mere handful of people in this country, and Chartism was forgotten. Yet who shall say that Chartism was a failure, or that Karl Marx had failed? We, at any rate, have succeeded in making the teachings of Karl Marx more widely known to and accepted by a larger number of people here than knew anything about him or them in his lifetime; and if we have failed in rallying the main body of the working class to our banner, the reason is to be found in the nature of the circumstances. That reason is explained in the warning addressed to our comrade Hyndman by Lady Dorothy Nevill. To what extent that warning has been fulfilled can be seen by the sops of 'social reform' with which Liberals and Tories succeed in gulling the workers.

"In publishing his reminiscences our comrade Hyndman has not only given us an interesting record of an adventurous life, he has also rendered a real service to the movement, as affording an insight into the influences at work in its past development and the difficulties to be encountered in the future. We generally find biographies rather dull. In this book, however, there is not a single dull page: it is full of a live and engrossing interest, and should find a wide circle of readers."

Gaylord Wilshire says: "It is a book that no Socialist who pretends to keep up with the movement should fail to have in his own library."

PRICE - $3.50 Post Paid.

WILSHIRE BOOK CO.,
113, East 26th Street, New York.

WILSHIRE BISHOP CREEK MINE

92 PER CENT. EXTRACTION SECOND LEVEL ORE

The following is a report of tests made on a very large sample of ore taken from the 290ft. level of the Wilshire Bishop Creek Mine. The ore as seen had a content in gold of .7 ozs., or $14.46 per ton. The Extraction was from 91 per cent. to 92 per cent.

G. W.

THE GOLDEN CYCLE MINING COMPANY.
MILL DEPARTMENT.
Colorado Springs, Colo.,
September 25, 1911.

The Bishop Creek Milling Co.,
Bishop, Cal.

Gentlemen,—Herewith result of test work on the sample of your ore forwarded by Mr. J. S. Chapman. An analysis showed the following result :—

Insol	86.3 %
Iron	4.67%
A1 203	1.80%
Cao	2.60%
Sulphur	1.7 %
Lead	None
Zinc	,,
Copper	,,
Ignition loss ...	1.6 %
Gold	.70 oz. per ton
Silver	.06 oz. per ton

As can be seen from the above, there was nothing in the ore to prevent successful cyanide treatment, and the first test made was of the simplest kind, as follows :—

The ore was ground so that the coarsest was a moderate grade sand—see mesh analysis below. The pulp was then mixed with a solution containing 4 lb. KCN and 1.8 lb. lime per ton, 3 of solution to 1 of ore.

The residue obtained was :—

TEST I.

40 mesh	1%	assaying	.16 oz.
60 ,,	6%	,,	.10 oz.
80 ,,	9%	,,	.12 oz.
100 ,,	18%	,,	.10 oz.
150 ,,	21%	,,	.08 oz.
150 ,,	45%	,,	.08 oz.

Average tail ..... .0892 oz.
Cyanide consumption, 8 lb., lime 1.5 lb.

This test indicates the necessity of finer grinding, and also the possible necessity of concentration before cyanidation ; or, if crushing in cyanide solution is adopted, to concentration before final sliming.

TEST II.

The same treatment was given the ore, except that it was concentrated before cyaniding, 33.1% of the values being removed in a 5 oz. concentrate. The concentrate tails were then cyanided exactly as in Test I. Results :—

40 mesh	1%	assaying	.12 oz.
60 ,,	6%	,,	.10 oz.
80 ,,	9%	,,	.10 oz.
100 ,,	18%	,,	.06 oz.
150 ,,	21%	,,	.04 oz.
150 ,,	45%	,,	.06 oz.

Average tail ..... .0624 oz.
or 91% total extraction.
Cyanide cons., 7 lb. per ton, lime 1.4 lb.

The benefit of concentration on the final tails is shown by the increased extraction obtained in Test II. as compared to Test I. The coarse part again shows the need of fine grinding.

TEST III.

Ore ground to all pass an 80 mesh screen, and agitated in a 3 to 1 solution containing 4 lb. KCN and 1.5 lb. lime per ton. No concentration used. Results :—

100 mesh	27%	assaying	.12 oz.
150 ,,	23%	,,	.08 oz.
150 ,,	50%	,,	.08 oz.

Average tail ..... .09 oz.,
or 87% extraction.
Cyanide consumption, 9lb., lime 1.5lb.

TEST IV.

Same as Test III., except the pulp was first concentrated. A 6 oz. concentrate was obtained representing a recovery of 48% of the values by concentration. The concentrate tail was then treated exactly as in Test III. Results :—

100 mesh	27%	assaying	.06 oz.
150 ,,	23%	,,	.06 oz.
150 ,,	50%	,,	.06 oz.

Average tail ..... .06 oz.,
or 91.4% extraction.

A comparison of Tests III. and IV. again shows the value of concentration.

TEST V.

This was made on a far larger scale than Test IV., but otherwise under exactly similar conditions, and with the object of checking Test IV. The result was as follows :—

100 mesh	27%	assaying	.06 oz.
150 ,,	23%	,,	.06 oz.
150 ,,	50%	,,	.05 oz.

Average tail ..... .055 oz.,
or an extraction of 92.1% by concentration and cyanidation.
Cyanide consumption, 8 lb. per ton, lime 1.5 lb.

This result practically checks Test IV.

TEST VI.

This was a test to determine the advisability of cyaniding the concentrates at the mill. A mesh analysis of these concentrates follows :—

100 mesh.....	20%
150 ,, ...	23%
200 ,, ...	11%
200 ,, ...	46%

They were agitated in a 6 lb. cyanide solution containing 1.5 lb. lime per ton. 3 solution to 1 of ore.

Head value	6 oz.
Residue obtained ...	.22 oz.
Extraction	96.3%

This Test shows a remarkably easy extraction on the raw concentrates.

TEST VII.

An amalgamation test of the ore yielded an extraction of 30%. This test is harder to make on a small scale than the cyanide tests, and too much reliance must not be placed on it. The practical results would probably be higher than this indicates.

TEST VIII.

Precipitation of the gold from the solutions obtained in the foregoing tests presented no difficulty on zinc shavings, or by zinc dust methods.

State of the Solutions.—The general condition of the solutions throughout the tests was good, very little fouling took place—certainly not enough to cause any anxiety.

Chemical Consumption.—You will notice that I have put down the cyanide consumption as it came out in each test. My whole experience has shown that a good plant never requires the amount of cyanide indicated by test work. Your ore may not require more than ⅓ lb. KCN per ton when once settled down to working conditions, and no excessive use of lime will be needed —certainly not more than will help to settle your slimes.

The Residue Obtainable.—The above tests were always so limited as to conditions that all the results can be duplicated or bettered on a working scale in an average mill.

Type of Plant Recommended.—Rock breaker followed by any *standard* machine to crush, to, say, a 20 mesh, possibly here use amalgam tables followed by concentration on Wilfly or similar make of table. Regrinding in tube mills to all pass at least 100 mesh, possibly further concentration. Pulp settled in Dorr settlers and passed on to Pachuca type agitators, and thence to a good type of filter, vacuum or pressure as preferred.

I would make the plant tight and crush in cyanide solution. The concentrates I would grind to pass 150 mesh, and agitate and filter separately from the general mill pulp.

I believe zinc dust would be the best method of precipitation, although zinc shavings would be quite practicable.

An all sliming plant is cheaper to erect than a mill containing both sand and slime plants ; and if horse-power is cheap, but little, if any more, costly to run than such a plant.

Your ore does not show more than an average extraction, but it is capable of a very simple and cheap treatment, presenting, as far as the above sample shows, no chemical difficulties whatsoever.

I cannot recommend too strongly the advantages of using standard machinery throughout. A new mill is no place to make experiments in any shape or form.

Yours truly,

(Signed) A. L. BLOMFIELD
(Mill Superintendent).

Printed for the Proprietors by the Twentieth Century Press, Limited (Trade Union and 48 Hours), 37a, Clerkenwell Green, London, E.C.